

Vision Group B-Governance and Medical Control
Meeting Minutes, Oakland Fire Station # 22
February 23, 2000

I. Introduction

Members Present: Chuck Baucom, Chair, Ron Blaul, Co-Chair, Bill Cody, Mike Harris, Virginia Hastings, Ray Johnson, Bill McCammon, Lou Meyer, Gerald Simon

Members Absent: Joe Barger, Nancy Casazza, Jennifer Hardcastle, Kelly Hubbell, Richard Mayberry

Alternates Present: Jan Ogar, Barbara Pletz, Kevin White

Alternates Absent: Sheldon Gilbert, Ron Mayfield, Michael Osur, David Nevins

Audience Members: Michael Frenn, Leonard Inch

EMSA and Vision Office Staff Present: Maureen McNeil, Miranda Swanson, Richard Watson, Claudia Zagrean

II. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes were unanimously approved.

III. Business Items:

A) Focus Group #3 - Objectives 15 & 16 (shared governance, 201 & 224).

The group discussed the concept of a “local Commission”, shared governance and non-fractionalized participation in the system. The following **key points** were expressed concerning this concept:

- Local Commission should have mandated final authority.
- It was suggested that the concept of shared governance be addressed for further clarification.
- Shared governance should be defined; in order to have the Commission as the final authority, it needs to have all participants represented.
- In order to have a Commission with mandated final authority, groups within the Commission should have authority over their areas of expertise. There is a missing link between the Commission and the state. The possibility of the commission reporting directly to the state was discussed.
- Governance issues shouldn’t go to the Board of Supervisors until the Commission has approved. The duty of the Board of Supervisors should be administrative review with no authority to change anything the Commission has approved.
- A link is needed to fill in the void between the local Commission function and the state.

- The concept of a shared governance body does not include the issue of financing.
- Governance boils down to who controls the money flow.
- There needs to be a balance in the revenue system.
- The “Commission” will take money out from the control of the Board of Supervisors and shift funds to some other entity; concern was expressed about the group possessing the expertise to do this.
- Further clarification is needed on who controls the money. Payors and stakeholders have control in the flow of money.
- For the County it is not a flow of money, but an obligation; County has an unfunded liability if system has problems.
- Concept of rich cities giving to the poor cities was discussed.
- Need to agree on policy, then get into details.
- It was suggested that using a governmental vehicle that already exists would allow for a faster accomplishment of committee objectives. However, the committee emphasized the need for progress, not pressure for immediate products. Vision 2000 is all about **changing** the governance structure.

Action Item 1: Committee vote on getting an evaluation from a legal professional

Moved (Inch), seconded (Johnson), passed to accept Lou Meyer’s offer to have CAA’s legal counsel, Mike Scarano, provide legal advice.

It was emphasized that multiple evaluations from more than one attorney would be very useful. Group members were encouraged to submit the issue independently, in order to get expert legal advice. Suggested time frame for getting the evaluations was two weeks.

The following questions were formulated and will be submitted for review to Mike Scarano. The group refined a list of items that should be evaluated regarding the concept of a mandated final authority body, as listed below.

Questions:

- 1. How do we construct a body that has full final authority on these areas (see attachment “B” of Focus Group #3 report):**
- 2. Identify areas that are problematic to this process including, but not limited to:**
 - Contracting authority**
 - Legal liability**
 - 17 K Responses**
 - Ralph Brown Act**
 - Conflict of interest**
 - FPPC**
 - Financial liabilities**
 - Antitrust**
- 3. Review legal changes required to facilitate (accomplish) this process.**

Action Item # 2: Committee vote on the concept of mandated final authority body

Moved (Inch), seconded (McCammon) passed to conceptually agree in the shared governance process through the mandated final authority of a local governing body (not through county entity), and non-fractionalized participation in the system. Financing must be addressed and mandated final authority will occur through shared governance.

IV. Future Items:

- Next meeting will take place on April 12, 2000 in Ontario. Time and meeting room arrangements to be finalized later.